

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A241

Representation in Congress, 2nd District

Year	Republican candidate	Vote	Democratic candidate	Vote	Winner's majority
1923 (special)	Morton D. Hull	56,355	Barratt O'Hara	42,427	13,928
1924	do.	113,349	Frank A. Wright	37,482	75,867
1926	do.	71,750	Michael C. Walsh	37,518	34,232
1928	do.	126,005	do.	76,909	50,096
1930	do.	76,665	do.	63,341	13,324
1932	P. H. Moynihan	113,447	Victor L. Schlaeger	102,099	11,348
1934	do.	81,034	Raymond S. McKeough	104,479	23,445
1936	do.	130,197	do.	163,193	33,001
1938	Noble W. Lee	108,483	do.	129,620	21,137
1940	P. H. Moynihan	146,927	do.	155,698	8,771
1942	Thomas J. Downs	106,552	William A. Rowan	110,069	3,517
1944	do.	138,579	do.	186,089	47,510
1946	Richard B. Vail	156,697	do.	148,995	7,702
1948	do.	85,119	Barratt O'Hara	91,648	6,529
1950	do.	83,023	do.	71,945	11,078
1952	do.	89,080	do.	94,253	5,173
1954	do.	49,970	do.	80,016	30,046
1956	George B. McKibbin	69,892	do.	86,386	16,494
1958	Harold E. Marks	34,203	do.	75,691	41,488
1960	Bernard E. Epton	52,028	do.	103,535	51,507

with any gold for such nonmonetary purposes and presumably enable retention of at least \$82 million per year instead of issuing it for industrial uses, not counting the inflow of an increasing amount of newly mined gold. However, the Treasury would be standing by to supply gold to industry, upon request, at \$70 per fine ounce.

All this would be accomplished without disturbing our international arrangements for settlement of trade balances and redemption of foreign dollar credits on the basis of \$35 per fine ounce.

Although my bill would not constitute a major solution of the highly complex and serious gold problem, it would be a step in the right direction, besides giving a boost to our gold miners. Accordingly, in behalf of this legislation, I solicit the consideration and support of my colleagues in the Congress.

Twenty Elections in the Second District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with the convening of the 87th Congress there has come to me, due to the generous and appreciated graciousness of my constituents at election times, the distinction of representing the Second District of Illinois in this historic body longer than any Representative in its history with the sole exception of the Honorable James R. Mann, who served from 1897 to his death in November of 1922.

At the special election to fill the Mann vacancy the Honorable Morton D. Hull was the successful Republican nominee. I was the unsuccessful Democratic nominee. Mr. Hull served with great distinction in five Congresses. He died in 1937. It was not until 11 years after his death that I came to the Congress. It is with a sense of humility and deep gratitude that I contemplate that good health, good fortune, and the warm friendships of my fine constituents had extended my tenure as the Representative of the Second District to a period second only to that of Congressman Mann.

In 1924 Congressman Hull, a Republican, was reelected with a majority of 75,867. In 1960, I, a Democrat, was reelected with a majority of 51,507. These are the 2 highest majorities given winning nominees in the last 20 elections in the Second District. For such interest as they may hold to students of election trends and statistics, I am extending my remarks to include the official vote cast in the Second District of Illinois in these elections, 1923-60, as furnished me by the Honorable Charles F. Carpentier, secretary of state of Illinois.

Eisenhower Unique Among Presidents on Leaving Office—Few, If Any, Have Had Such Universal Good Will of Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Courier-Times, January 10, 1961:

EISENHOWER UNIQUE AMONG PRESIDENTS ON LEAVING OFFICE—FEW, IF ANY, HAVE HAD SUCH UNIVERSAL GOOD WILL OF NATION

This is a busy evening for President Eisenhower. He will be the honor guest at a dinner in Washington at which he will receive the Herbert Hoover Medal for 1960, and then he will be hurrying home to watch the hour-long television documentary broadcast on his life and career beginning at 10 o'clock.

The Hoover award has been given each year since it was first presented to former President Hoover in 1930 for leadership in the fields of engineering accomplishment, international relations, and civic development. Mining, electrical, mechanical, and civil engineering societies sponsor the award.

The National Broadcasting Co. television show, "Tribute to a Patriot," features actor James Stewart as narrator, and includes taped tributes from such persons as President-elect Kennedy, Prime Minister Macmillan of Britain, Prime Minister Nehru of India, Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany, Gen. Mark Clark, Vice President Nixon and others.

For a time it appeared that Vice President Nixon would be among the missing on the show, an absence so conspicuous that it lent itself to speculation that there had been a rift between Eisenhower and the Vice President. Nixon later recanted on his refusal to take part, and the case of "friendly witnesses" to the Eisenhower years now appears complete.

It is only 10 days now until President Eisenhower will be completing his administration, and it seems significant that there have been few, if any, Presidents in the history of our country who have completed their terms of office and departed from the

White House with such universal goodwill and approbation as the people of the United States have for him. President Washington is said to have been "first in the hearts of of his countrymen," but it is doubtful if even he was more widely admired.

If we add the dimension that a change is not only being made in the man in the White House, but also in the political party there, President Eisenhower's position is seen to be even more unique. When the old and the new Presidents ride down Pennsylvania Avenue from the Capitol to the White House together on Inauguration Day, the retiring President very commonly has been subjected in a campaign a few weeks earlier to the blame for all of the country's ills. So high is President Eisenhower's prestige, that his political adversaries very carefully avoided any personal attack upon him in the last campaign.

Any man who serves the Nation in the White House literally gives his life for his country. From the moment he takes up residence at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, his life is no longer his own. He is saddled with enormous responsibility and subjected to merciless, and often unfair, criticism. Every retiring President ought to be given a hero's tribute by the Nation.

H.R. 5730 file
Espionage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill in the field of espionage which I feel deserves the early attention of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The limitation upon the application of existing espionage laws to acts committed either in the United States, on the high seas, or within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States has prevented prosecution of acts of espionage committed against the United States in foreign countries. There is no justification for such a limitation. It is imperative that the laws of this Nation protect it from acts of espionage committed abroad as well as at home.

To give our criminal laws such extra-territorial effect is not novel. In the case of *United States v. Bowman* (260 U.S. 94), the Supreme Court held that citizens of the United States while in a foreign country were subject to penal laws enacted to protect the United States and its property. Crimes against the United States committed abroad are triable, under section 3238 of title 18, United States Code, in the district where the offender is found, or into which he is first brought.

Similar legislation has twice before passed the House of Representatives, but has failed for want of action by the other body. I am hopeful that the bill can be handled early enough this year to reach the other body well in advance of the date of adjournment.

They Don't Believe in God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks to include therein an article by the one and only David Lawrence, editor of the U.S. News & World Report.

Mr. Speaker, this is a reprint from the issue of U.S. News & World Report of December 27, 1957, and I think it is truer today than it was then. This article, as you will note, is headed, "They Don't Believe in God." Well, Mr. Speaker, we do, and that does give us a better chance. The only trouble is I sometimes wonder if we believe in God enough, but now I am putting this great article by David Lawrence in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which will go to every library in this country and many foreign countries, into every beat in this Nation, and I believe it will do a lot of good. I know it will with all right-thinking people that believe in God.

I believe every word that David Lawrence has written in this great article that they have reprinted 3 years later, and I believe this should have had our attention, not only 3 years ago but a long time before. But I know this, Mr. Speaker, we are all going to do our very best and with God and the people on our side, and if we work and pray hard enough, nothing can keep us from winning.

We hear and read about the dark clouds but we can brush them all away if we all stay closer together and work with our own people here in this great Nation, and fight back the Communists who are trying to engulf us not only here, Cuba, and South America, but everywhere:

THEY DON'T BELIEVE IN GOD

(By David Lawrence)

There was a vacant chair at the meeting in Paris last week.

The chair should have been occupied by the head of a free government that could have represented the many nationalities liv-

ing in a vast area from the Baltic to the Pacific.

The reason why such a government does not exist today is because a few willful men hold the reins of power in Soviet Russia. They govern with a despotism that denies liberty to tens of millions of people.

Fifteen governments—freely chosen by the people in each country—sent their chief executives or prime ministers to the Paris meeting to take steps to defend their territory against the threat of attack persistently raised by the irresponsible group in the Kremlin.

If a free government existed in Moscow, the Paris conference could have been devoted to the fulfillment of the ideals of progress and human betterment in a peacetime world.

But the enemy government—master, for the time being, of friendly peoples who really wish to live in peace with the rest of the world—continues its strategic game of menace and intimidation.

The whole world is kept in a state of incessant fear because the rulers in Moscow have no morals—no sense of right and wrong.

For the fact is that the leaders of the Communist regime do not believe in God. One of their main tenets is an antagonism toward all churches and all religions.

Those who do not believe in God make their own rules. They avow that the end justifies the means.

Those of us who do believe in God avow a faith in the rightness of moral teachings as derived from the Bible itself. Man thereby feels an obligation toward man—as brother to brother. There is no desire to kill, no desire to destroy savings and the fruits of toil, no desire to threaten the unity of millions of homes throughout the world. There is only a desire to live and let live.

The Moscow rulers, of course, argue that this is exactly what their proposals of peaceful coexistence mean. Unhappily such professions are not persuasive because they are built upon an atheistic doctrine which is quite ready to promise anything and then treacherously to violate the most solemn of promises.

There is expressed by some gullible persons in the free world today the wishful thought that the Soviets seek an armistice with the West and that the time has come to negotiate a deal. From many well-meaning persons in our midst here and abroad comes the renewed suggestion that there be another summit conference like the one in Geneva in 1955. It is being said again with the same naivete as before that the conference plan is worth trying because, even if the effort fails, we shall know where we stand.

But by this time don't we know where we stand? Don't we know that such conferences are merely vehicles for more propaganda and flagrant defiance of the ideals of free men?

Our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, in a recent article in *Life* magazine, aptly expressed the meaning of such proposals when he wrote:

"We have an armistice agreement with the Communists in Korea. But it is worthy of note that the Communist side violates every provision of that agreement except the one provision that we enforce; namely, that they shall not advance militarily beyond the armistice line."

We of the West have drawn such a line in Europe, too, and, as a result of the sensible agreement made in Paris last week by the NATO Council, we are preparing to establish bases in Europe for our missiles and stockpiles of atomic weapons. We do this because we think it is the only way to prevent war.

If we were dealing with men of conscience, all of Europe could be disarmed. There would be no need of missile bases or stockpiles of nuclear weapons.

But we are dealing with men who boast of their contempt for religion—they do not believe in God.

In the Western World, theism is the basis of every constitutional right, every principle of free government. We are confronted in Moscow not with theoretical or philosophical atheists, but with practicing atheists.

For atheism is immorality. It has no regard for human life. It worships instead at the shrine of a materialistic and godless ideology.

This is not just a question of tolerating a belief contrary to our own. It involves realistically a stern threat to survival itself.

The world is not going to be safe for any of us as long as atheistic communism is enthroned in Eastern Europe. There is nothing else to do but to shore up our defenses. At the same time we can fervently speak what is in our hearts to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain and pray with them for deliverance. For in the millions of them who still believe in God rests the hope of mankind. They must inevitably find a way to set up a government of freedom. Their faith and our faith together can alone save the world from another war.

The Gold Crisis—An Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an article by James P. Warburg published in the New York Times magazine section, January 8, 1961.

Mr. Warburg, a stimulating and distinguished commentator on economic and political affairs, was formerly an adviser to President Roosevelt and vice chairman of the Bank of the Manhattan Co.

In the article entitled "The Gold Crisis—An Analysis," Mr. Warburg has made thoughtful and penetrating comments regarding our economic and monetary policies which deserves the careful study of all Members of the House.

The article follows:

THE GOLD CRISIS—AN ANALYSIS

The current dialog over the gold crisis reminds me of similar discussions in President Roosevelt's oval study during the early days of the New Deal. Then, as now, gold was being drained from the United States. Widely differing analyses of the cause of the trouble led to a variety of remedial proposals, ranging from the ultraorthodox to the fantastically radical.

In the end, the gold crisis was overcome less by monetary experimentation—although the gold embargo did provide a breathing space—than by the restoration of confidence, by certain necessary domestic reforms and by the long-overdue adjustment of U.S. tariff policy to the Nation's altered position in the world.

There is now no domestic crisis such as existed in early 1933. Our economy is fundamentally strong. No radical legislative reforms are needed. To restore healthy economic growth it is primarily necessary to remove the shackles imposed by an ill-advised fiscal policy of pseudo-conservatism and to shift the emphasis from stimulating